

2007 TAC Roster and Attendance				
Member	Agency	Jan	Feb	
Ian McAvoy (Co-Chair)	SamTrans	yes	yes	
Vacant (Co-Chair)	San Mateo County Engineering			
April Chan	Peninsula Corridor JPB	yes		
Duncan Jones	Atherton Engineering	yes	yes	
Fernando Bravo	East Palo Alto Engineering	yes	yes	
Gene Gonzalo	CalTrans			
George Bagdon	Burlingame Engineering	yes	yes	
Jon Lynch	Redwood City Engineering	yes	yes	
Joseph Hurley	SMCTA	yes	yes	
K. Folan / M.Roddin	MTC			
Larry Patterson	San Mateo City Engineering	yes	yes	
Liz Cullinan	San Carlos Planning	yes	yes	
Mark Duino	San Mateo County Planning	yes		
Meg Monroe	Burlingame Planning	yes	yes	
Mo Sharma	Daly City Engineering	yes	yes	
Parviz Mokhtari	San Carlos Engineering	yes	yes	
Randy Breault	Brisbane Engineering	yes		
Ray Davis	Belmont Engineering	yes	yes	
Ray Towne	Foster City Engineering	yes	yes	
Reza (Ray) M. Razavi	South San Francisco Engineering	yes	yes	
Rick Mao	Colma Engineering		yes	
Ruben Nino	Menlo Park Engineering	yes		
Sandy Wong	C/CAG CMP	yes	yes	
Tatum Mothershead	Daly City Planning	yes	yes	
Van Ocampo	Pacifica Engineering	yes	yes	

**TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)
FOR THE
CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (CMP)**

**February 15, 2007
MINUTES**

The one hundred sixty-fifth (165th) meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was held in the SamTrans Offices, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, Bacciocco Auditorium. Co-chair McAvoy called the meeting to order at 1:20 p.m. on Thursday, February 15, 2007.

TAC members attending the meeting are listed on the Roster and Attendance on the preceding page. Others attending the meeting were: Richard Napier – C/CAG, John Hoang - C/CAG; Brian Lee – San Mateo County Public Works; Dave Clarke - San Mateo County Public Works; Jim Bigelow – CMEQ; Richard Napier, C/CAG, Sandy Stadtfeld - URS Corp; Jill Hough – Hexagon; Pat Dixon - SMCTA CAC; Sean Co – MTC

1. Public comment on items not on the agenda.

No Comments.

2. Issues from the last C/CAG and CMEQ meetings.

John Hoang stated that items approved from the February C/CAG and CMEQ meetings would be brought to the next TAC meeting. Richard Napier noted that at the February C/CAG meeting, the Board approved the Congestion Relief Plan and the STP Local Streets and Roads Scoring Criteria recommended by the TAC.

3. Approval of the Minutes from January 18, 2007.

Approved.

4. Measure A Update – Strategic Plan Development

Joe Hurley indicated that the Strategic Plan Development presentation would be covering the methodology of how the projects are being evaluated and assessed. The Transportation Authority (TA) will not be presenting project priorities at this point but rather will be seeking inputs from the TAC as to whether the criteria considered for the process are appropriate. Representatives from the consultant team of URS Corp. and Hexagon presented on the current project evaluation methodology, evaluation criteria, and progress of the strategic plan.

TAC members were provided a handout listing all the projects, in no priority order. Consultants indicated that the following measures and criteria are considered in the evaluation process:

- For Screening purposes: check that project is consistent with regional and local plans

- Core criteria considerations include: congestion relief, assessment of cost/benefits, proportions of Measure A share, size of benefit (contribution of project), ridership, and safety impacts.
- Supplemental criteria includes: demographic sensitivity, economic benefit, environmental impacts, geographic equity, systems connectivity, transit oriented development, uncertainty associated with cost estimate and/or design, and traffic user travel experience, overall estimated capital cost, effective measures (vehicle hours traveled - VHT), cost effectiveness, change in VHT, change in operating speeds, change in number of fatal accidents, and others.
- Weighing factors will be incorporated to the scoring criteria
- Projects will be analyzed quantitatively based on the build and no-build scenarios.

Comments and questions from TAC members are summarized as follows:

- Does the Strategic plan take into considerations both the “new” Measure A and the old Measure in 1988? Projects identified in the two versions may overlap. The new Measure identifies “key congestion corridor” and supplemental projects. The evaluation process may need to consider segregation of the projects.
- How is the area of impact defined in the analysis? The area of impact are defined by the improvement, therefore, every project area is customized.
- Scoring will need to consider both technical and non-technical aspects
- The criteria may be skewed. That could be addressed by incorporating weighing factors
- Will need to take into consideration whether weighing will be different for different type of projects
- How would you differentiate between projects with high volumes versus projects with low volumes? Will need to consider ridership and the number of trips generated.
- Why is field collision fatality used rather than injury data? Injury accident may be a better indicator. Should look at other studies to see what type of data was used. Consultant to check to see whether non-fatal injury data is available.
- How would input for the “user travel experience” be generated? How would the data be qualified and quantified?
- How would the funding uncertainty be measured? May need to be measured subjectively. This is a gray measure that will need scaled responses.
- What is the timeframe for the completion of the scoring process? It is anticipated that the final scoring will be completed in the summer.
- Highway projects may be easier to evaluate.
- Will need to consider sensitivity analysis by trying different scenarios with regards to applying weighing factors.
- The updated cost to 2006 dollars, which used a 3.5 % inflation rate, may be low.
- How can cities participate through this process? Rather than deal with individual cities, the TAC will be the forum.
- More time is needed to review the list before it comes out.

5. Status on Ramp Metering (Phase 1) Implementation

Sandy Wong updated the TAC on the results of the ramp metering. Metering was turned on in the southbound US-101 direction the end of January. Caltrans monitored regularly at the onset, performing floating car runs and adjusting metering as needed. Observed waiting times were determined to be within expectations. Minor adjustments at the

Hillsdale loop and Whipple HOV/Single Occupancy lanes were addressed. The initial reports indicates a better than expected time savings. The NB US-101 ramp metering will be turned on is expected in March. C/CAG consultants are performing “before and after” monitoring on local streets. The “before” monitoring has occurred already. The “after” monitoring is expected to begin in April or May. The Ramp Metering Technical Committee will be reviewing the data.

Questions and comments included:

- Have there been any indications that the implementation of ramp metering has pushed traffic onto local streets?
- Are there any problems in general?
- Are the detectors working?

Bring back in April or May to have enough info for evaluation.

6. MTC Routine Accommodations Checklist

Sean Co, MTC, presented on the Routine Accommodations Checklist. The Checklist was developed in accordance with MTC Resolution 3765, which indicates that projects funded through MTC should consider needs of bicyclist and pedestrian. A Technical Advisory Committee comprised of the CMA, MTC staff, local jurisdiction, and members of the regional Bike/Pedestrian Committee developed the Checklist. The Checklist, which consists of 10 questions, is intended to be a disclosure documents only and will not preclude jurisdictions from receiving funds from MTC. The CMAs will have the discretion to decide when the Checklist will need to be completed, whether along with the project application, or later in the process. MTC will provide on-line tools to facilitate the completion of the Checklist and plans to store all completed checklist for all projects online. This Checklist will most likely be implemented at the next STP/CMAQ call for projects. MTC will audit and evaluate the process and make improvements as necessary. Notifications will be sent out to all jurisdictions.

Questions and comments included:

- The Checklist should be completed at the time of project application for funds.
- The recently approved San Mateo County LS&R Scoring Criteria addresses only pavement maintenance and rehabilitation projects, therefore the Checklist may not apply.

7. Member Reports.

Due to conflicts with next months’ Public Works Directors meeting, the March TAC Meeting will be cancelled. With the cancellation of the March meeting, at the request of staff, the TAC approved the recommendations made by the consultant selection committee with regards to selection of a consultant for the Incident Management – Alternative Plan project. The recommendation will be brought forward to the CMEQ in February and to the C/CAG Board for approval in March 2007.

The meeting adjourned.